

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please amend the drawings by replacing FIGs. 1-6 with the respective identically numbered FIGs. 1-6 attached herein.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and remarks is respectfully requested. In the outstanding office action, claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1-16, 19, and 22-26 are rejected. Claims 17, 18, 20, and 21 are objected to.

In response to the office action, claims 1, 8, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, 23, 24, 25, and 26 were amended. Claims 18 and 21 were cancelled. Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 19, and 22 were unchanged.

It is respectfully requested that the Docket Number in this application be changed to read: MESH017.

Objection to the Specification

In response to the Examiner's objection to the specification, paragraph [0036] of page 12 has been amended accordingly.

Objection to the Drawings

In response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings, FIG. 1 has been amended to indicate element 144 "microwave backhaul" as described in the specification on page 12. Formal drawings have also been prepared and submitted herewith replacing informal drawings FIGs. 1-6.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge with thanks the allowability of claims 17, 18, 20, and 21 once amended to be rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have so amended claims 17 and 20 accordingly and incorporated the limitations of claims 18 and 21 into various independent claims as described below.

Double Patenting Rejections

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the provisional rejection of Claims 15 and 16 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 7 of copending application no. 10/218,638 in view of the amendments to Claims 15 and 16 to include the limitations of allowable Claims 18 and 21 respectively.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the provisional rejection of Claims 1,2,8,9,19, and 22 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending application no. 10/218,638 in view of Dorenbosch (US20020118663) in view of the amendments to Claims 1 and 8 to include the limitations of allowable claims 18 and 21 respectively. Applicant further respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 2, 9,19, and 22 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending application no. 10/218,638 in view of Dorenbosch (US20020118663) as Claims 2, 9,19, and 22 contain further limitations of the now believed to be allowable amended claims 1 and 8.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the provisional rejection of Claims 23, and 25 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 7 of copending application no. 10/218,638 in view of Dorenbosch (US20020118663) in view of the amendments to Claims 23 and 25 to include the limitations of allowable claims 18 and 21 respectively. Applicant further respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 3 and 10 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 7 of copending application no. 10/218,638 in view of Dorenbosch (US20020118663) as Claims 3 and 10 contain further limitations of the now believed to be allowable amended claims 1 and 8.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the provisional rejection of Claims 24, and 26 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 5 of copending application no. 10/218,638 in view of Dorenbosch (US20020118663) in view of the amendments to Claims 24 and 26 to include the limitations of allowable claims 18 and 21 respectively. Applicant further respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 4 and 11 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 5 of copending application no. 10/218,638 in view of

Dorenbosch (US20020118663) as Claims 4 and 11 contain further limitations of the now believed to be allowable amended claims 1 and 8.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the provisional rejection of Claims 6,7,13, and 14 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending application no. 10/218,638 in view of Dorenbosch (US20020118663), and further in view of Beason (US 6,373,430) as 6,7,13, and 14 contain further limitations of the now believed to be allowable amended claims 1 and 8.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 19, and 22 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch (US20020118663) in view of Roberts (US 4,873,711):

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 19, and 22 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch (US20020118663) in view of Roberts (US 4,873,711) as herein amended to include the limitations of allowable Claims 18 and 21.

Rejection of Claims 15, 16, 23, and 25 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch (US20020118663) in view of Roberts (US 4,873,711), and further in view of Phillips (US 4,972,455):

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 15, 16, 23, and 25 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch (US20020118663) in view of Roberts (US 4,873,711), and further in view of Phillips (US 4,972,455) as herein amended to include the limitations of allowable Claims 18 and 21.

Rejection of Claims 2, 3, 9, and 10 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch (US20020118663) in view of Roberts (US 4,873,711) as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Phillips (US 4,972,455):

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 2, 3, 9, and 10 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch (US20020118663) in view of Roberts (US 4,873,711) as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Phillips (US 4,972,455) as herein amended to include the limitations of allowable Claims 18 and 21.

Rejection of Claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch (US20020118663) in view of Roberts (US 4,873,711) as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Beason (US 6,373,430):

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch (US20020118663) in view of Roberts (US 4,873,711) as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Beason (US 6,373,430) as herein amended to include the limitations of allowable Claims 18 and 21.

Rejection of Claims 24 and 26 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch (US20020118663) in view of Roberts (US 4,873,711), and further in view of Barany (US 6,839,356):

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 24 and 26 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch (US20020118663) in view of Roberts (US 4,873,711), and further in view of Barany (US 6,839,356) as herein amended to include the limitations of allowable Claims 18 and 21.

Rejection of Claims 4 and 11 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch (US20020118663) in view of Roberts (US 4,873,711) as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Barany (US 6,839,356):

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 4 and 11 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch (US20020118663) in view of Roberts (US 4,873,711) as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Barany (US 6,839,356) as herein amended to include the limitations of allowable Claims 18 and 21.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.


In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc, with any fees which may be required in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

January 27, 2006

Motorola, Inc.
8000 West Sunrise Boulevard
Law Department – MD1610
Plantation, Florida 33322
Customer Number: 24273

By: 
Randi L. Karpinia
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 46,148
Tel: 954-723-6449
Fax: 954-723-3871
E-Mail: Randi.Karpinia @ Motorola.com

Enclosures